

To: CN=Walter Mugdan/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: CN=Benny Conetta/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Doug Garbarini/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Gary Klawinski/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;king.david@epa.gov[]; N=Doug Garbarini/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Gary Klawinski/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;king.david@epa.gov[]; N=Gary Klawinski/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;king.david@epa.gov[]; ischer.douglas@epa.gov;king.david@epa.gov[]; ing.david@epa.gov[]
From: CN=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Mon 2/14/2011 3:55:36 PM
Subject: Re: Model
Naranjo.Eugenia@epa.gov
fischer.douglas@epa.gov
king.david@epa.gov
fischer.douglas@epa.gov
king.david@epa.gov
Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov
king.david@epa.gov
Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov
fischer.douglas@epa.gov

Thank you Walter. We are working with our contractors and ERDC to provide a realistic budget that will get us to and through the peer review process. We have a good collaborative process with their modelers and our modelers at the moment, however, we are just implementing tests/modifications to the baseline sediment transport process (meaning, we still have a lot of work to do).

Do you have a sense of whether GE should cover the costs of the peer reviewers and the management of their contracts, etc?

eugenia

Eugenia Naranjo
United States Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866
212-637-3467
Naranjo.Eugenia@epa.gov

-----Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Benny Conetta/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US
Date: 02/09/2011 01:02PM
Cc: Doug Garbarini/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Eugenia Naranjo/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, fischer.douglas@epa.gov, Gary Klawinski/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, king.david@epa.gov
Subject: Re: Model

I spoke to Bruce Adler earlier this week. The answer is yes -- GE is inclined to continue on with model development and the peer review process. I stated again that we could only do this if we get additional funding. He fully understands our position, but of course was entirely non-committal in response (as I would have expected). I think it is now up to us to make a specific funding request of GE. We presumably should figure out how much more \$\$ we will need to carry the process through to some reasonable conclusion. We should then communicate this to GE and indicate that if we aren't able to work out the funding we will have to reduce or wind down our involvement.

Inactive hide details for Benny Conetta---02/02/2011 09:17:46 AM---Hi Walter, Did you ever hear back

from Bruce on this?Benny Conetta---02/02/2011 09:17:46 AM---Hi Walter, Did you ever hear back from Bruce on this?

From: Benny Conetta/R2/USEPA/US
To: Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Eugenia Naranjo/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, fischer.douglas@epa.gov, Doug Garbarini/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, king.david@epa.gov, Gary Klawinski/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/02/2011 09:17 AM
Subject: Re: Model

Hi Walter,

Did you ever hear back from Bruce on this?

Thanks

-----Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov, Benny Conetta/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, king.david@epa.gov, Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov, Eugenia Naranjo/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US
Date: 01/14/2011 03:24PM
Cc: fischer.douglas@epa.gov
Subject: Model

I spoke to Bruce Adler. He was not up on the issues, but will check around and let me know where GE stands.